

Cross-Community Working Group on Use of Country/Territory Names as TLDs TRANSCRIPT

Monday 8 June 2015 at 1900 UTC

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

On page: <http://gns0.icann.org/calendar/#jun>

Attendees:

ccNSO

Ron Sherwood, .vi

Annebeth Lange, .no (Co-Chair)

Joke Braeken, .eu

Jordi Iparraguirre, ccNSO Council NomCom appointee

Paul Szyndler, .au (Co-Chair)

Mirjana Tasic, .rs

GNSO

Heather Forrest, IPC (Co-Chair)

Carlos Raul Gutierrez, NPOC

Susan Payne NTAG

Griffin Barnett, IPC

At-Large

Cheryl Langdon-Orr

ISO

Jaap Akkerhuis

Apologies: none

ICANN staff:

Bart Boswinkel

Lars Hoffman

Patrick Jones

Nathalie Peregrine

Coordinator: Recordings have now started. You may proceed.

Nathalie Peregrine: Thank you very much Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everybody and welcome to the CWG on User of Country and Territory Names as TLDs on Monday, 8th of June, 2015. On the call today we have Heather Forrest, Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Annebeth Lange, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, Mirjana Tasic, Susan Payne, Jordi Iparraguirre, Ron Sherwood, Griffin Barnett, Jaap Akkerhuis, (Paul Schindler), Joke Braeken.

We have received no apologies today's call. And from staff we have Bart Boswinkel, Lars Hoffman, Patrick Jones, and myself Nathalie Peregrine. I'd like to remind you all to please state your names before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you ever so much and over to you Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you Nathalie. Then we'll give it a thought and I will try to lead you through the discussion today. And as the first issue on the agenda we have the review of the comments submitted to the auction paper on the treatment of two-letter codes. And Lars you have put it out so we can all see it. And it has been sent out to everyone as well.

And thank you very much for the activities you have shown to send in submissions. This is most useful for the way forward. And as you know Lars has systemized the submissions into Section 114, potential options for the use of two-letter codes.

And in addition to those already included in the document received we have a few comments from other people. I don't think yet that comments have been included. And neither has (Yungem) or (Mariana) and Elise Lindberg from the Governmental Advisory Committee.

And I suppose you Lars will include these together with comments received during the conference call so that we have the best possible starting point before Buenos Aires.

Lars Hoffman: Absolutely Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, good, good. We see already that are differences in use in how two-letter codes should be treated. But as I see it, our mission is not to decide but to put on the table the different views with benefits and risks of the different options. And then in that way I think we have done quite a good progress since last time.

It would be useful if anyone participating in this call but haven't already given their view could do so. So please I leave the floor to you now and anyone have the comment on this?

Man: Susan Payne. Susan I think you (unintelligible).

Heather Forrest: Annebeth, this is Heather. Could I get in the queue?

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Hi Heather, okay.

Woman: Are you ready for me now?

Annebeth Lange: Susan, are you there?

Heather Forrest: Yes. I just wanted to make a comment about input from the GNSO. This document went out to the GNSO a bit slower than it went to the ccNSO, and it's entirely my fault. I was overseas and I was ill. We did have an update to the GNSO Council that happened on - Lars might be able or Carlos might be able to help me with the actual date. It was May 18 I think.

In any event, Council's aware of what we're doing. Council's aware of our request for information and we've gotten back a few comments from GNSO counselors, but not many. So it's really just to apologize. We're probably a

week and a half behind the ccNSO in terms of getting comments from the GNSO. And for that I apologize.

Annebeth Lange: That's okay Heather. We don't have that rush. And as the GNSO doesn't have the same procedure as ccNSO or the other way around actually, you are in a way more professional than that and we have things to learn from you I think. So when I come to Buenos Aires, my plan is to have a presentation from the ccNSO of how far we have come and ask for more comments.

But this is things we have to discuss now in the proposed outreach in the Point 3. Don't you think that we can find a way to go forward with the next issues we're going to discuss? Hello?

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. Yes I agree with that approach, yes.

Annebeth Lange: Yes okay. So any comments from anybody else? I think it's not the time to go into the details in the document. It's a lot of different views and so there's (a calm) on the table and that is most useful. But in my view we should wait a little further till we get in those who haven't had the opportunity to react. And also the ccNSO as a whole should have a possibility to see.

Bart Boswinkel: Susan has raised her hand Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Good thing that you're following. I can't see it all here. Susan, go ahead.
Hello?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars. I think Susan has gone to chat. Her mic doesn't seem to be working, and I think she's starting in. So...

Annebeth Lange: Okay.

Lars Hoffman: ...we might go back to her in a minute.

Annebeth Lange: Okay, then if she come back again. Does anyone else have a comment on this? Nothing? Very silent. Okay if there are no comments further on this Point 2, let's move on to Point 3 in the agenda, the proposed outreach. And then Carlos and I had agreed on he's taking the lead here. Since this is the GNSO we can learn from the GNSO here.

So could you perhaps Carlos something about the way you do it? And perhaps we could adopt that for the other stakeholder groups as well?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes please. Okay we have conveyed a meeting in Buenos Aires. I think it's going to be Monday the 22nd at 13 hours (unintelligible), so correct me if I'm wrong, but you will see in the agenda.

Annebeth Lange: (Unintelligible), right, mm-hm.

Carlos Ruiz Gutierrez: And we have pushed - as Heather mentioned - we have pushed within GNSO for more active participation and we are chasing, really chasing the GAC people to take a position if they would like to join forces or participate more active in our cross-community working group since they have their own working group.

And they have been (some mail) from that and we would expect to have a bigger group than last time and really focus on the structure that we have in front of us. And I think we have to actually to discuss one if they're asking. Language as compared with the other internationalized scripts. And the other question that we have put forward is about the definition.

I mean we had a very narrow definition in the two-letter codes, just two-letter codes. And we're trying to find out what people think about a broader definition. Not as broad as the applicant guide book in terms of going and consulting to community, etcetera, etcetera, but a little bit broader definition of what we do mean by country and territory name.

Those are like the two main questions that we think we would like to put forward and try to come to terms in that meeting. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: This is Annebeth again. I also want to tell you that I have been in contact with the Norwegian GAC representative, Elise Lindberg. She was quite active in the study group but she's not been active at all or she's not even included in this working group for now.

But she told me today that they are kind of worried about the whole geographical things, and it's a lot of discussion in the GAC about it. And it seems (IANA) and has taken most of their time just now. I know that several of the GAC members will try to be more active in the future.

The problem is how long do we have to wait to get their attention if (IANA) isn't finished at this meeting for what I can see. Susan, can I come back to you? Do you have your comment here now?

Susan Payne: Yes thank you, and I'm really sorry about that. Can you hear me now?

Annebeth Lange: Yes we can hear you.

Susan Payne: Oh good, oh good. I'm sorry. I've been having problems with my microphone. I thought I'd fixed it but I clearly haven't. Yeah, it was - and I think whilst I was trying to get connected by phone you may have been saying that you didn't particularly want to go through the comments that people had put forward and kind of critique them.

But I did want to make a point which may come across as doing that, which is just that a number of the comments that have been submitted so far talk about the benefit of maintaining the differentiation between ccTLDs and gTLDs, you know, by maintaining the distinction between two letters being CCs and not being released to gTLDs.

And this isn't necessarily a disagreement with that, but I think that ignores the reality of the fact, which is that some ccTLDs have effectively sold their domain to private usage so that for example, Dot TV or Dot PW, I mean, they are ccTLDs. But there is no way that they are being operated as such.

And so there already is no distinction for some ccTLDs between the ccTLD and the gTLD in practice. And I think we have a number of comments which are talking about a distinction which is already being increasingly blurred. And I think we have to acknowledge that.

Annebeth Lange: This is Annebeth again. I agree in many of the things you were saying, Susan, but one thing that is different, the association between the cc and the g, is that it's at least in principle, it's the local Internet community in the community which has been delegated the two-letter code that decides the way it's going to be used.

And in very, very small areas where they don't have the people enough to cover up to have use only for as a cc, they use it to get some things into the country. And it's the local Internet community that has decided how to use it. So I'm not sure if the way to go forward if we're going to start using the original ccTLDs as gTLDs that many people would feel that they are (used as).

And the way is to remove the distinction at all because most of the CCs in the world are used exactly like that. And taking away the differentiation between this you have to really, really think hard if we're going to do that. So it's not done just because we want to have more gTLDs.

Susan Payne: Could I just respond on that if I may?

Annebeth Lange: Yes, sure, sure.

Susan Payne: As I say, I'm not necessarily advocating for releasing the two letters to the gTLDs. I think we just need to acknowledge and reflect the fact that there is already a blurring of the distinction. And so, you know, once you're talking about, you know, future usage of two-letter codes maybe that have not yet been allocated, you know, I think the justification for retaining them for ccTLDs is maybe not so strong.

And I understand what you're saying, that it's the local community that's decided how to use it. And that could be a justification but that is not maintaining the differentiation between gTLDs and ccTLDs, and it is not avoiding user confusion. That is a different justification benefit to the local community if you like which is a financial and commercial one, but it's not about user confusion and maintaining differentiation.

Annebeth Lange: Mm-hm. This is valid point that we should get into the document, of course. So of course you're welcome to send them in so we can have them in writing. And at least you have said them now, and they have a transcript, and I think that Lars is going to put thing in from the transcript as well.

So Bart and (Paul) have their hands up. And also (Yungem). Can you start, (Paul)?

(Paul Schindler): Yes absolutely. Thank you for that. I think you and Susan worked through part of what I was going to say as you were having your exchange anyway, but I think it would be remiss of us in our final documentation not to address exactly what you said.

The cultural and (regime) difference between what has been with two-letter codes and what has been with three-letter codes, to note that it's a historical (unintelligible) intention that you mentioned behind the scenes (unintelligible) subsequently discusses that more whether the status quo should remain.

That's a separate issue, but I think we'll clarify a lot of the points that Susan made by just having a statement of fact of what the history has been and how they've grown differently in intentions of them - a different - I think that's useful.

The other issue I wanted to raise was more getting back to the point you were making a little while ago Annebeth about GAC awareness and engagement. I too have spoken recently at our usual pre-ICANN meeting with our government.

Part of the problem as you mentioned that Elisa's quite engaged previously. So was Peter (Unintelligible) from the Australian government, given he sat on the group that was, they had an umbrella group above the one that was looking at geographic names. That group no longer exists so their geographic names and their conversation is somewhat uncorralled now.

And (Peter) himself who was keeping a watching eye on this is another casualty because he's moved on to a different area, so Israel will have a new representative. So I share your fears about the discussions and about engagement with the GAC.

And I think the way you characterized it as they're talking about geographical stuff, that that honestly is about as in-depth as they've recently gotten. And from what I've seen of the GAC agenda, I don't think they really have any time at all in Buenos Aires to address the issue. So it's going to be an uphill battle.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, I agree. Thank you (Paul). Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart speaking for the record. Just going back to what (Susanne) (Sic) said and maybe this is more some factual background. In principle the ISO or say the two-letter code list is limited. That's one.

Secondly, which two-letter code will be assigned for a country and territory is not up to ICANN. It's done by the ISO 3166/MA. So in short it is not a static list. It's a dynamic list.

The consequence is if say leaving aside whether a future ccTLD will be less or more commercial, which is probably a different debate, is that as soon as say the line will be blurred, then in principle say the current policy for assigning the two-letter codes as documented in RFC 1591 needs to change fundamentally because then potential new countries and/or territories are not eligible for the ISO 3166 two-letter codes which has been assigned to them.

Annebeth Lange: Right. Annebeth here. Yes I agree completely about this. It's very important. Do not forget RFC 1591. And (Yungem)?

(Yungem): Yes, thank you. This is (Yungem) speaking. I'd like to (lead) upon the point what Annebeth has said regarding the cc space having a relatively special status. And notwithstanding the fact that Bart just said that the 1591 could be the ISOC list is that a flexible one.

But I'd just like to make a point that the cc space is representing the many, many different countries of the world, which is a very special space within the (unintelligible) system that is very different from the gTLD system. And I know that CCs do not take all the - by no means will be taking all the two-letter codes in the future no matter how flexible the ISO list is.

But I mean the details in this space currently - and this is a point that I made in my written comments before - but the gTLD space has all the space above the three-letter codes - three-letter, four-letter, five-letter, six-letters - and so I would just like to say that the gTLD space currently has an enormous sort of area in which they can expand.

And I know that some people or many people would prefer the two-letter codes but this is - I think this is a very special space that represents the CC

world, and I would caution against opening it up for anything else other than the cc space. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you (Yungem). Annebeth here again. (Paul), you have your hand up still? Is this a new - or have you forgotten to take it down?

(Paul Schindler): I'm sorry. Just being lazy thanks.

Annebeth Lange: Okay. Is there anybody else with their hand up? Yes Heather.

Heather Forrest: Thank you. Thank you very much. Apologies. I can't put my - I have my hand up (fortunately), but you...

Annebeth Lange: No, but I know your voice so that's okay.

Heather Forrest: You can't see my hand up here. Thank you very much. This is Heather. I wanted to comment on two things. One, Susan's comment. I think we've done a very good job, and it's taken a fair bit of effort in the front end of the document in talking about the background and the context to identify where there are developments - in other words, where the historical or the intentional policy let's say has differed over time.

So we have a, "Well that was then and this is now," kind of perspective. And I think that that's very important that we do that not only in the general background context, but as Susan points out, in relation to any of these categories of name that we're looking at at the moment. Its two-letter codes.

So I do think it's important that we capture what Susan has said and we do properly reflect on that. I think that's a point very well made.

The second comment goes to, Annebeth, what you were discussing before we went down this line, which is the engagement with the GAC. And I can

add this, and I'm happy if anyone wants to hear what I've said. You can chase down the transcript of the last GNSO Council meeting.

I made a very personal comment in the council meeting, almost a plea for help. And Carlos can comment on this if he likes. My comment was this - and I believe I said it in our previous meeting here and across the Cross-Community Working Group - which is I think we're headed for disaster to the extent that we continue on this path of working in parallel to the GAC and we end up with two different results.

Annebeth, it's a point that you've made a number of times and I take it to heart. So I really brought this to a head within the GNSO Council and said we really need to sort this out before we go. We bury more months into this Cross-Community Working Group and then someone wakes up and says, "Ah, yes, but the GAC wants something different."

It's not in any way, shape or form that I think that this working group should be stopping its efforts. It's simply that I think we need to have that discussion. And in my mind that really needed to be escalated within the GNSO Council, and it has been. Carlos and I discussed it and how we wanted to approach it in the last GNSO Council meeting.

So I would like to think that in addition - and it's fantastic that we have more GNSO let's say representatives on this call -- I think that's wonderful but I'm very much looking forward to guidance from the GNSO Council in Buenos Aires as to how we manage this sort of political impasse that we have between our working group and the GAC working group.

And I don't think it's simply a matter of IANA is sucking everyone's time because it's sucking everyone's time, not just the GAC. I think that this initiative, based on (Paul)'s comments, that this is going fairly unchecked in the GAC.

I think that sets us up for - you know, as it is we have a tremendous amount of work to do in this group. And to the extent that that work is made redundant in the end, I'd like to think that we'd do whatever we can at this stage to prevent redundancy.

So let's say - not to say my comments are reserved for the next two weeks, but until we get to Buenos Aires and have some guidance as to how we interact better with the GAC and how we manage this, I suppose I'm personally in a watch and see situation.

Anyway, I just wanted to put that out there so that everyone knows comments that I raised and that this is in fact escalated within the GNSO Council. And perhaps - I don't know how the ccNSO Council goes about things. Annebeth, that's for you and (Paul) and Bart to discuss - and others. I don't know if you folks want to draw this to a head as well. Thank you very much.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you so much Heather. It's useful for us. I think the problem also is that you are in the council. I'm not. (Paul) is not. And we have some different ways of working. So I've been discussing this with Bart and we have to find a way to do this perhaps better.

But I agree with you completely that the GAC is the key because we can't use so much time as we do and then suddenly when we have got all these hours and all this effort into it and then they say no, we can't do that because we want something else.

Is it possible to try to arrange a meeting or at least a short talk with Thomas Schneider during Buenos Aires, Bart? Lars, do you think it's even possible?

Bart Boswinkel: Go ahead Lars.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Annebeth?

Annebeth Lange: Yes Carlos, I hear you. Yes?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: I am - when Heather raised this issue at the last GNSO Council call, Jonathan Robinson wrote down that he was going to take it up with Thomas. We have a clear indication from last time in Singapore when we went, you know, with the GAC. Thomas said that it's a clear, clear priority for the GAC to have something so before the new round - before any new round.

By that I don't know if he means country codes or geographic names. You know, this is another issue that (user) is behind. I mean we have concentrated ourselves really to country names and we know that the GAC has been burned or has some troubles with wider geographic names that I don't want to mention here, you know.

But he said it's in the top of the agenda of the GAC. Jonathan Robinson said last week that he's going to take it up with Thomas. And of course we have to follow up with Thomas Schneider, Thomas in Buenos Aires. I don't know how. That was my only comment.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you Carlos. Anyone else? Do you have more (unintelligible) on how to go forward? Heather again?

Heather Forrest: Yes this is Heather - very quickly - apologies. My comment is simply this. I wouldn't like to derail that formal engagement between the GNSO Council and the GAC, given then I did put that on the action list if you like. And Jonathan has specifically taken that up.

While I wouldn't deny the opportunity to speak to Thomas informally, I would like to see that that post is - because it is I think now a formal one within the GNSO. The GNSO Council's quite concerned.

So I wouldn't let's say want to schedule any sort of formal meeting with Thomas Schneider that might somehow derail that process, which is why I

say I'm waiting in a sense. I think Carlos and I are waiting for marching orders from Jonathan Robinson and others to see how they feel about it. So thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Okay. Thank you. Bart, you have your hand up?

Bart Boswinkel: Yes, two things. I think this topic may be say useful for us to raise at the joint ccNSO/GNSO council meeting on Monday afternoon. I know say normally this - say the Cross-Community working groups and their activities are part of that meeting. So the co-chairs could report back and raise this as an issue for the joint councils. So that's one.

As to the ccNSO and its workings, say the council and the ccNSO has a different role than in the GNSO. So going back that is something I will discuss with (Paul) and Annebeth over the next week. Say if you want to engage with the ccTLD community, it's more that the members' decision is all members of this working group or the ccNSO appointed members reach out to the ccTLD community - not so much through council.

And if you have an issue, raise it with the GNSO, with the ccNSO Council at one point. And that's the difference that both (Paul) and Annebeth are not on the council. But either I can raise it on your behalf or we can raise it directly with the ccNSO Council.

But say I think the most important one is to sync the approach with both the ccNSO and GNSO on Monday afternoon. And you have the opportunity to discuss it further for on Monday afternoon at the Cross-Community Working Group meeting itself and then maybe raise it at the ccNSO GAC meeting on Tuesday as well.

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Thank you Bart. We have a lot of things to do in Buenos Aires. That's for sure. Okay, can we leave this? And it's been more to discuss about how to outreach for the SOs and ACs.

What we had on the agenda was the three-letter codes. But I suppose it's the main thing will be to just get a better way to work and to convey our results to the SOs and ACs. It doesn't matter very much if it's two-letter codes or three-letter codes or later code names.

Lars Hoffman: Annebeth, this is Lars. Can I just intervene for a second...?

Annebeth Lange: Sure, sure. Hi Lars.

Lars Hoffman: ...on this issue. Thank you. So I kind of marked this onto the agenda for the three-letter codes. But you're absolutely right. We can take this also back to two-letter codes.

What we do in GNSO to give -- if you're not familiar with the processes -- what we do in GNSO working groups is once the group gets underway at the very beginning and we have our charter question. Before even the discussion has started, there's usually a letter has been sent out to all SO/ACs, regardless of whether they're members on the working group and to also all the GNSO stakeholder groups and constituencies to ask them for their views.

So these are not formal submissions. They don't take part in any consensus building. They're basically just feeling out the community and see what their views are and it gives a starting point. And it also assures that everybody has been aware - been made aware - of the issues being discussed.

So I was wondering whether something like this was a little bit unconventional maybe for a cross-community working group, due to its very nature, including several communities. But it might be good to reach out and do something like this either for the three-letter codes or for more.

This would be post-BA. It would have to give people obviously some time to respond. And so send out to the leadership specific questions on the issues

we're dealing with and what their views are. And we would then deal with it. We would be under no obligation to take any of it on board, it then shows that this often generates a very fruitful and helpful discussions.

And I was going to put this to the group if you think it's something that might be useful. I'd be very happy to assist if you think it was. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you Lars. Talking for myself I think it's a really good idea, but Bart you are the one that knows the way the ccNSO works better than I do. What do you think? Wouldn't this be a better way to work?

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. It's - I think at this stage it might be good to have a discussion first among the chairs and of course among the group first because I think what I know is we may jump on people not aware of it.

And doing this for the first time with the cross-community working group, say even in the accountability and stewardship and the IG, say what you see is a more mature document before sending questions to and asking for specific input from other SOs and ACs.

So I'm a bit reluctant of opening up the process right now with the working group still is trying to grapple with stuff.

Annebeth Lange: Mm-hm. Annebeth here.

Heather Forrest: Annebeth?

Annebeth Lange: I see what you mean.

Heather Forrest: This is Heather. May I comment?

Annebeth Lange: Sure.

Heather Forrest: I think Bart raises an interesting point. But I would like to think that perhaps we had discussed in our last meeting and perhaps the meeting before that that we do as we close up our discussion on or transition our discussion from two- letter codes to three-letter codes, we had it in mind that we would do a progress report at the end of two-letter codes.

And I suppose that could pave the way for this informal seeking of support. It might be a logical bridging point if you like. But we have this progress report similar to the progress report we sent around last September that says, "Here's what we're doing. Here's what we've gotten to, and here's where we're going ahead."

And that might presage the seeking of formal advice. So that might handle Bart's concerns about confusion as to why are we receiving this. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, that might be a way forward. It's Annebeth here again. And also during the BA meeting, I have ten minutes in the ccNSO meeting to give a short presentation on where we are and what we are doing. So at least some of those two are not into this at all. We have a little taste of what's going on.

So Bart I think perhaps it's a good way to talk about more about this in Buenos Aires. What do you think?

Bart Boswinkel: Annebeth and Heather, I fully agree. Say once you have a progress report - and that's probably what you see, what the study group did and what other working groups are doing as well - once you have a progress report and have a clear sense of what you're seeking feedback, it's a natural - almost a natural point to seek feedback on the progress made to date without say so people know what is expected and why their feedback is so.

So I think that's an excellent idea of how to say having a progress report, using this to seek feedback because then it's more a - it's clear what you do

and what the working group is doing and what is expected of those who provide feedback.

(Paul Schindler): If I can just add to that very quickly if I may Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, sure.

Lars Hoffman: I'd just like to qualify. I completely agree with what everybody said 100%. I just want to quickly clarify I think we're talking about two slightly different issues. So sending out a progress report or, you know, an initial feedback to seek feedback on achievement is obviously something that I hope we're going to see once we get there, and I think that's a very good way forward.

And the suggestion I had in mind was to - so it's not - and I understand maybe that - I mean to ask for input on the questions we are faced with, to see what the community thinks about this relatively ad hoc. And it's something the ccNSO would have received, the council at least. They will have received letters from GNSO.

They might not have chosen to provide any input, but obviously that's everyone's prerogative. So it's not - it wouldn't be an official request that the public comment on something that's been achieved. It's an informal outreach to gather feedback and thoughts and seek where everybody stands.

So it's a slightly different issue. And I think we would obviously have to make that clear when we reach out. But I wouldn't want to send our (unintelligible) right now and say what do you think about this. That's not what I had in mind.

I would say that, you know, we're having this issue of three-letter domains and two-letter domains, explain what the issues are and say, "What are your views?" Similar to the table we've sent out amongst group members in fact and send something like out to the wider community.

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Well I think we can talk more about this in Buenos Aires. Perhaps this is a point for the agenda for the meeting. We're going to meet on Monday from 1:00 to 2:30. So are there any suggestions for other way to go forward and what we're going to discuss in Buenos Aires for 1-1/2 hours?

Lars Hoffman: This is Lars Annebeth.

Annebeth Lange: Yes.

Lars Hoffman: Obviously we would complete - so usually what we would do because it's an open meeting is to give an overview of the achievements. And we'll hopefully have the first draft of the progress report by then to kind of summarize what we've done since the last report in September last year.

And I think this would be good to show the community we're at. And then I think getting to the nitty-gritty of this options table and going through the various points put forward and see how the room and the (unintelligible) members react to that would be good. And obviously this would be updated also then.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, I agree. Heather, did you say anything?

Heather Forrest: Yes please. I think Lars is exactly right. I can only endorse what Lars has said. I think it's a good opportunity face to face to have that discussion and make comments - substantive comments, as difficult as that is to do on the fly if you like. But let's seal off if we can our discussions on the options paper.

And Lars dare I ask - are you able to help us with a first draft of that progress report? Or are you swamped between now and BA?

Lars Hoffman: Heather I have a final report for a different group due by I believe Wednesday 2359 UTC. And as of Thursday I'll be working on the progress report. So I'm

pretty sure that before I take up to BA which is Thursday week I will send out a first draft.

Heather Forrest: You're a marvel.

Annebeth Lange: Lars, what should we do without you? It's good to have you - really good.

Heather Forrest: My question then is this: How do we deal with - I'm going to ask the million dollar question - how do we deal with the GAC in Buenos Aires? Do we put time in the agenda for them? Do we put time in the agenda for talking about them? How do we deal with that?

Annebeth Lange: It's Annebeth here.

(Paul Schindler): (Unintelligible)

Annebeth Lange: Yes, okay Lars, come on.

Lars Hoffman: No it's (Paul) I believe.

Annebeth Lange: It's (Paul). Okay, my fault. And Carlos, actually sound off as well. Go on (Paul).

(Paul Schindler): Sorry, I was just going to chip in my 20 cents' worth to respond to the question that was just posed. And I see limited value at the moment in terms of meeting with or talking to - because it's really talking to - it's talking at the GAC.

There has been that churn of stakeholders as I mentioned. And let's not forget Thomas hasn't been in the chair all that long. So I think some sort of behind-the-scenes (pincers) movement's probably the better thing to do now, whether that first means let's have those conversations with Thomas. Let's,

you know, see what comes from the GNSO approach and then, you know, we move it from there.

It's only once we've done that ground work, and I know we're going back a few steps because we used to have a little more engagement, but I just think it might not be very fruitful to schedule time with them and given that this isn't a headline issue at the moment that everybody's concerned with, I could easily see that, you know, we've had it in the past where our ten minutes becomes five minutes becomes 90 seconds.

So I think it would be optimistic to try to get significant air time with their plenary in BA.

Annebeth Lange: I agree (Paul). Carlos?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Yes I just wanted to comment that we have to follow up their meeting on the issue. I understand that the GAC group has grown tremendously by 400%, so it's not only one person but four - four countries. And in any case I will try to follow up when they're planning to meet and that will be the right time to show up and hear what they're doing. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Fine. I agree. We try to find out what they are doing and what they are thinking about. At least as Bart said try to come and mention on it on the council meeting between GNSO and GAC and ccNSO and GAC and at least make it where we are and our concerns.

Heather Forrest: Annebeth this is Heather, very quickly.

Annebeth Lange: Yes, sure.

Heather Forrest: I was really referring to our agenda. And I agree with (Paul) that I don't think it's very fruitful at this stage to have a separate - to try and devote let's say time to this in our own agenda because you know it's not supposed to be the

inverse if this then consumes our whole agenda. And I don't want to see that happen. I would like to see the bulk of our discussion be for the substance on two-letter codes and then how we move forward.

So I suppose and this stage, to the extent that we address any of this, that that should happen - my view is that that should happen in any other business. But I'm happy if others disagree and want to make a different point. Thank you.

Annebeth Lange: Yes. Susan you had your hand up?

Susan Payne: Yes.

Annebeth Lange: Susan, are you there? Yes.

Susan Payne: Yes, yes. Just quickly - and I don't disagree with Heather at all on that - but I was just going to say that I have a meeting this week with the UK's GAC rep, and I believe he's on the Geographic Working Group. So I will try to find out from him how actively they're meeting and so on.

I think they've had one meeting recently. I'm not sure how actively they're meeting and whether they're meeting as a subgroup in Buenos Aires or not. I know they are presenting to the wider GAC in Buenos Aires on the Tuesday morning, but I presume that will just be a progress update.

Annebeth Lange: Mm-hm.

Susan Payne: If I find out anything useful I will report back.

Annebeth Lange: Thank you Susan. I think when we all meet our representatives with our country we can use the opportunity to say something at least about it. Anyone else that wants to say something or has some good ideas before we close up? Any other business?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Annebeth, Cheryl here. Just my usual awareness please during this particular meeting NomComm will consume just about every moment of my time. So it is likely that I might not be able to make the face-to-face meeting. But note my apologies and I will...

Annebeth Lange: We understand that. And it's very good to have you on the meeting every time we have a teleconference (unintelligible).

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: I did (unintelligible) the agenda however.

Annebeth Lange: Yes you're one of the active ones. Thank you. Okay, anyone else? Something more we have to talk about? Lars will this be the last meeting before Buenos Aires? Do you think it's time for more meetings? Or should we leave it at this?

Lars Hoffman: I think this was - I think it was the last meeting before Buenos Aires. People will start traveling next week. Carlos just raised his hand if we want to say something.

Annebeth Lange: There's so many on the list now, so I don't see the hands. Hi Carlos. Come on.

Lars Hoffman: Carlos you might be on mute.

Annebeth Lange: Carlos?

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Sorry, that was an old hand.

Annebeth Lange: Oh, okay. So this time it's so many participants so you had to scroll up and down to find the hands raised. (Unintelligible). All right, anything else?

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: There is a trick to that, tell you how to change your view so when you're managing a meeting you will always know who's doing what because it's at the top of the list, so...

Annebeth Lange: Good, good. This is my first time, so I'm very inexperienced.

Lars Hoffman: I've already made a final mental note. We'll take care of it in BA.

Annebeth Lange: We got through.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Well done.

Annebeth Lange: Okay, so then if there isn't anything more then I just want to wish everyone a safe trip when we - and we'll meet in Buenos Aires in a little more than a week.

Carlos Raul Gutierrez: Thank you Annebeth.

Woman: Outstanding. Thank you Annebeth.

Man: Bye-bye.

((Crosstalk))

Annebeth Lange: Bye-bye. Yes that's right...

END